

45. (original) A device according to claim 1, wherein said tire is configured so that said tire changes color when the vehicle changes speed.

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-45 are pending in the subject application. After entry of the above amendments to the claims, claims 1, 3 and 29 have been amended. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejection of the claims in view of the above amendments and remarks as set forth herein below.

1. Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 29 has been amended in response thereto.

2. Claims 1, 18-12, 14-20, 22, 25, 27, 28, and 30-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leguillon (U.S. 1,989,703). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Leguillon discloses a decorated automobile tire, as shown in Figures 4-7. Leguillon does not disclose the claimed combination including “a colored digital image developed on at least fifty percent (50%) of the outer sidewall surface of the tire according to the claimed invention. Specifically, the latex rubber decorating stock 19 in the tire of Leguillon (Figs. 4 and 6) is

substantially less than fifty percent (50%) of the outer sidewall surface of the tire based on geometric measurement of the side elevational view shown in Figure 6, and does not teach or suggest expanding the decorated area. Further, Leguillon only discloses applying the latex rubber decorating stock 19 by spraying (page 2, column 2, line 45), and does not teach or suggest developing the colored digital image. The spraying application of the latex decorating stock 19 of Leguillon is different, and somewhat limits the type or extent of color decoration (e.g. limited to more simple decorations or designs, shading difficult, text capability is limited), and much more difficult application process (i.e. much more labor and time intensive verses digital color development). Thus, Leguillon does not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

3. Claims 1, 8-10, 12, 14, 15, 21, 23, 24, 26, 30-36, and 39-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ono (JP 08156501). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ono discloses both single and multiple logos or marks for application on a tire sidewall. A single logo is shown in Figure 1 and three (3) logos are shown in Figure 2. Ono does not disclose the claimed combination including a colored digital image developed on at least fifty percent (50%) of said outer sidewall surface of the tire. Specifically, the logos shown in Figures 1 and 2 of Ono represent only a small portion or surface area of the outer sidewall of the tire. Ono does not teach or suggest significantly expanding the size of these logos. Further, Ono discloses a temperature indicating coding material applied to a sheet as compared with developing a colored digital image. Thus, Ono does not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

4. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-16, 18 and 30-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyazaki (U.S. 6,235,376). This rejection is respectfully traversed.


Miyazaki, *et al.* discloses a display label for a tire. Miyazaki, *et al.* does not disclose the claimed combination including a colored digital image developed on at least fifty percent (50%) of said outer sidewall surface of the tire. Specifically, as shown in Figure 1, the display label 10 only covers a small portion of the outer sidewall surface of the tire, and does not teach or suggest significantly expanding the size of the display label. Further, Miyazaki, *et al.* discloses that the “display information may include at least one of pictures, characters, symbols, photographs, and patterns other than bar codes” (see column 11, lines 29-30). Miyazaki, *et al.* does not disclose developing a colored digital image. Thus, Miyazaki, *et al.* does not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the claims are in condition for allowance, and allowance is respectfully requested.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required beyond those that my otherwise be provided for in accompanying documents. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are necessary and hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to our Deposit Account No. 11-1243.

Respectfully submitted,

KLIMA LAW OFFICES, P.L.L.C.



William L. Klima
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,422

Date: April 24, 2006

P. O. Box 2855
Stafford, VA 22555-2855
(540) 657-9344